

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 8-15, and 17-23 are all the claims pending in the present application, claims 7 and 16 having been canceled as indicated herein. Claims 1-11, 13-16, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Louis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,023). Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Louis in view of Wambach et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,097,369). Claims 12 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Louis in view of Mallet et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,174).

**§ 102(b) Rejections (Louis) - Claims 1-11, 13-16, and 21**

Claims 1-11, 13-16, and 21 are rejected based on the reasons set forth on pages 2-8 of the present Office Action.

Briefly, Louis is directed to an integrated graphic tablet/touchpad that can be toggled between an absolute (graphic tablet) input mode and a relative (touchpad) input mode. In the relative mode, a graphics window appears on an associated display only when pressure is exerted on an input surface, and a cursor can be moved by stroking the input surface. In the absolute mode, a window is always displayed, and the cursor is relocated to a new position in the window each time a stylus or finger is moved onto the input surface.

With respect to claim 1, Applicants amend this claim, as indicated herein, and submit that Louis does not disclose or suggest, “wherein said pointer comprises a sensor which determines the user’s motion,” as recited in claim 1. The movement of a screen in Louis is determined by someone or something touching an input surface, wherein the input surface senses the direction in which a screen is supposed to be moved. However, the movement of the pointing screen is

not based on a sensor on a pointer determining a user's motion. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that Louis does not anticipate claim 1.

Applicants similarly amend claim 21 and submit that this claim is patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-6, 8-11 and 13-15<sup>1</sup> are patentable at least by virtue of their ultimate dependencies from independent claim 1.

With respect to dependent claim 11, Applicants submit that Louis does not disclose or suggest, at least "wherein in step (a), a speed of movement of the pointing screen is set," as recited in claim 11. The Examiner cites col. 3, lines 35-42 and col. 8, lines 44-65 of Louis as allegedly satisfying the features of claim 11. However, the cited portions of Louis only generally discuss methods for controlling a cursor on a display. Further, at col. 8, only a window motion element for moving a particular window is discussed. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion of setting a speed of movement of the pointing screen itself. Setting a cursor speed is not the same as setting the speed of movement of a pointing screen.

§ 103(a) Rejections (Louis/Wambach) - Claims 22 and 23

The Examiner rejects claims 22 and 23 based on the reasons set forth on pages 9 and 10 of the present Office Action. Applicants traverse these rejections at least based on the following reasons.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants cancel dependent claims 7 and 16 without prejudice or disclaimer.

First, Applicants submit that dependent claims 22 and 23 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies from independent claim 1. Wambach does not make up for the deficiencies of Louis.

Further, with respect to claims 22 and 23, Applicants submit that the applied references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest at least, “wherein said sensor comprises at least a fixed member disposed on one segment of a finger and a moving member disposed on another segment of said finger,” and “wherein said access, said fixed member, and said moving member constitute the same device,” as recited in claims 22 and 23, respectively<sup>2</sup>. To support the rejections of these claims, the Examiner directs Applicants’ attention to the alternative embodiment of Wambach that is briefly discussed at col. 5, lines 15-20. The cited portion of Wambach only briefly teaches that the motion sensing switches are located on a finger so that all motion sensing devices follow the index finger. However, this extremely general teaching of the locations of motion sensing devices does not satisfy the specific features of claims 22 and 23. The Examiner is obviously utilizing impermissible hindsight reasoning in determining that the specific features of these claims are satisfied simply based on a single sentence that motion sensing devices are located on a finger.

Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 22 and 23 are patentably distinguishable over the applied references, either alone or in combination.

---

<sup>2</sup> Applicants amend dependent claim 22 for clarification purposes.

§ 103(a) Rejections (Louis/Mallett) - Claims 12 and 17-20

Applicants submit that claims 12 and 17-20 are patentable at least by virtue of their ultimate dependencies from independent claim 1. Mallett does not make up for the deficiencies of Louis.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778

Date: December 7, 2006